



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE WISDOM OF BEN SIRA.

(Continued from p. 474.)

II.

3. *Additional Notes on Chapters III–XVI.*

IN what follows use is made of the readings and notes of Dr. Peters, Dr. Strack, and Mr. Cowley.

The full and learned treatise of Dr. Norbert Peters on the Hebrew Text of Ecclus. (1902) gives a list of previous editions and other "mehr oder minder benutzte Litteratur" (pp. vii–xi), including Mr. Cowley's *Notes on the Cambridge Texts of Ben Sira* (*J. Q. R.*, XII, 109–111); Prof. Bevan's review; the present writer's *Studies in Ben Sira* (*J. Q. R.*, X, 470 f., 1898), but not his article quoted herein as *J. T. S.* See p. 441 of this volume.

Prof. Dr. Hermann L. Strack has recently brought out an excellent and inexpensive edition of the Text from the *Facsimiles*, with short critical notes. A copy of it reached me immediately after the completion of Part I of this article.

Mr. Cowley's article begins thus (*J. Q. R.*, XII, 109): "The following notes are the result of three days' study of the Hebrew fragments in the possession of Dr. Schechter. I went very carefully through the MSS., comparing them with the printed text in the *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, edited by Prof. Schechter and Dr. Taylor, and noting every point in which there was reason to differ from the reading adopted by the editors. The text is, however, so accurately reproduced that there is very little to alter in it, and

the proposed changes are mostly unimportant, or concern passages in which the reading must remain a matter of individual opinion. . . . With regard to MS. A, it is worth mentioning that, though the writing is distinct and usually well preserved, some letters . . . are often hardly distinguishable."

But the recension of the text attributed to the two Cambridge editors is, except in a single folio, the work of one editor only. In the Preface to the Cambridge edition I wrote (p. vi), "Of the Text in manuscript I have as yet read only the ninth folio (ch. 49. 12—50. 22), which was published as the first of Dr. Schechter's Genizah Specimens in No. 38 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Jan. 1898)." I had read this folio, the last but two of MS. B in the *Facsimiles*, before it was published as a specimen, and contributed a conjecture or two to the first edition of it¹; but I took no part in the first decipherment of the other Cambridge fragments. Here and there I speculated about readings in them, but only with reference to the printed text as prepared by Dr. Schechter for our edition, the originals not being at the moment accessible.

In this paragraph Mr. Cowley's notes are in italics. *Chap. v. 4. For ארך read ארך*. There is a dot above the *alef*, but it does not appear why. In the next line there is one over תבטה. Line 14 of the page has triads of dots right and left of it, but those on the left are given to the right of line 15 in the printed text. Another dotted word is מראש at the end of A (p. 474). *vi. 7. For בניסון read בניסין*. *vii. 16. For תחשיבך read תחשובך*. *21. After כנפש there is a hole: a letter may be lost*. After it Dr. Schechter writes אל, Dr. Peters ואל. *xii. 14 marg. For ען read עו; it should be one line higher: perhaps a variant for זרין*. *xiii. 6. For צריך read צריך*. The *yod* may be a repetition from עליך in the line above. *xiv. 13.*

¹ See in particular my reading of י . א בכלי והב, repeated in the footnote on Sir. l. 9 in *Camb. B. S.*, but not adopted in the "Notes on the Text" (p. 64).

For תמות read תמית. Part of מו is torn away. 16¹. *For לפני above the line read לכפי*; the correction is not quite distinct, and so is repeated in the margin. 18 c marg. *For ארחות read מתחות*. The scribe wrote and drew a line through בן ארחות, and then wrote בן דורות כו'. 27. *For ובמענותיה read ובמענותיה*. xv. 3. *For והאכלתה read והאכילתה*. Mr. Cowley's other notes on A are given separately below. xxx. 19 marg. *For מהונו read perhaps כמונו*, and note that Schechter gives ממנו as an alternative (Camb. B. S., p. 54). xxxv. 20. *For מ read ה...* All this illustrates the remark, "When the writing is indistinct *mem* may be read as or for *hé*, ..." (p. 471).

Sir. iii. 17. *And thou shalt be more beloved than one that giveth gifts*. Dr. Peters goes a step in the direction of the proposed emendation of Gr. (p. 442), and reads:—

καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον δεκτὸν ἀγαπηθῆσκη.

Here δοτικόν, for Heb. *giving gifts*, makes better sense, and some scribe would doubtless have corrupted it into the familiar δεκτόν.

Having written thus far I looked at Sir. iii. 17 simply from the point of view of form and rhythm, and seemed to see that it would be improved by the omission or detachment of בני at the beginning and a shortening of נתן מתנות at the end. With Prof. Israel Lévi's objection to ἄνθρωπον δοτικόν in mind I then thought of reading in Heb., as with allusion to Prov. xix. 6:—

וְתִתֶּנָּהּ בְּאִישׁ מִתֵּן :

This meets the said objection to ἄνθρωπον δοτικόν, which is as follows: "Mais cette explication ne résoudrait pas la difficulté; pourquoi, si G. avait eu sous les yeux notre leçon, aurait-il jugé nécessaire de mettre le mot *homme* et n'aurait-il pas rendu les deux termes hébreux? Au contraire, si l'hébreu portait אִישׁ חָסֵד ou אִישׁ חֵן (cf. Prov. xi. 17 et LXX), on comprend que S. ait cru bon d'expliquer cette expression hébraïque."

Just above this in *L'Ecclésiastique* I found something which I had previously overlooked. M. Chajes is there quoted as saying: "Peut-être G. avait-il sous les yeux וכל הרע 6 אִישׁ et S. a-t-il lu וכל הרע 6 אִישׁ, comme Prov. xix. 6 וכל הרע 6 אִישׁ. Cf. Prov. x. 24 וְהָיָה, traduit dans LXX par δεκτὴ = וְהָיָה." The supposed reading of Syr. is what I take to have been that of Gr. and Ben Sira.

On Prov. xix. 6 we read in Field's *Hexapla*, "*Et qui vivis est amicus viro doni* (liberali). Ο'. πᾶς δὲ ὁ κακὸς γίνεται ὄνειδος ἀνδρί (alia exempl. γίνεται ἐν δόσει ἀνδρός). Σ. καὶ πᾶς φίλος ἀνδρὸς δομάτων." Every one loves אִישׁ מִתֵּן. The phrase is an idiomatic one, which Ben Sira was likely to have adopted, and its original context suggests the use which I suppose him to have made of it. Sir. ii. 5 ἀνθρώποι δεκτοί, perhaps for אֲנָשִׁי רִצּוֹן, may have contributed to the corruption of δοτικόν into δεκτοῦ in the next chapter. Compare again Prov. xxii. 8 f. ἀνδρα . . . δότην . . . ὁ δῶρα δούς (*J. T. S.*, p. 572). From אִישׁ מִתֵּן would have come Heb. נותן מתנות an exegetic paraphrase.

Syr. in Prov. xix. 6 אִישׁ מִתֵּן כו', "*Et flagitiosis largitur munera*," אִישׁ מִתֵּן with no word for אִישׁ; but in Sir. iii. 17, "And more than a man that giveth gifts they shall love thee":—

סֶכֶךְ בְּכֹל אִישׁ מִתֵּן מִתְּנָתָיו.

This and Gr. attest Heb. אִישׁ, after which (I think) can only have stood מִתֵּן. Thus we come again to:—

וְהָיָה מִתֵּן מִתְּנָתָיו

From this may have come נותן מתנות or the like in any language, cf. Prov. *l.c.* R.V. and A.V., "And every man is a friend to him that giveth gifts," the A.V. only with marg., "Heb. a man of gifts." To a retranslator Syr. would have suggested אִישׁ or גִּבּוֹר, and not merely Heb. נותן מתנות. In Gr. there may have been other readings, now lost. A good word for אִישׁ would have been ἀνδρα, after which one may think of δότην as the archetype of Lat.

gloriam. Thus the whole clause may be given with alternatives as:—

καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων (al. ἀνδρα) δοτικὸν (al. δότην) ἀγαπηθήσῃ.

Sir. iii. 18. Following Gr., and taking account of the rhythm, I proposed (p. 442) to omit עולם and read:—

מעט עצמך מכל גדולה.

Peters, here and in chap. xxxv. 8, מַעֲט for מָעֵט. In Camb. B. S. I wrote (p. xvi), that Ben Sira “uses עולם (iii. 18, xvi. 7) for *world*, cf. Eccl. iii. 11 *also he hath set the world in their heart*”; but I now doubt the genuineness of עולם here and in chap. xvi. 7 (pp. 471, 472), and its use in the sense *world* cannot be inferred from Sir. xlv. *init.* Heb. [עולם] שבה אבות, Gr. πατέρων ὕμνος, with nothing at all for עולם. The piel of מעט is transitive in Ecclus., as I suppose it to be in Eccles. xii. 3 ובטלי המהנות כי מַעֲטוּ (J. Q. R., IV, 538).

Sir. iii. 21, 22. Raising no question about the text of these important verses, Strack gives them thus, without note or comment:—

21 פלאות ממך אל תדרוש ומכוסה ממך אל תחקור:

22 במה שהורשית התבונן ואין לך עסק בנסתרות:

To these and verse 23 *a* correspond the following verses in the Latin of Walton, which are numbered below as in the Polyglot:—

(22) *Altiora te ne quaesieris,*

Et fortiora te ne scrutatus fueris:

Sed quae praecepit tibi Deus illa cogita semper,

Et in pluribus operibus eius ne fueris curiosus.

(23) *Non est enim tibi necessarium*

Ea quae abscondita sunt videre oculis tuis.

(24) *In supervacuis rebus noli scrutari multipliciter,*

Et in pluribus operibus eius non eris curiosus.

“The Latin of Walton is supported by the *Speculum* attributed wrongly to Augustine, which in verse (22) gives

only the variants, *ne perscrutaveris: dominus: non eris curiosus*" (Hart).

Of variants in the Greek notice in verse 21 $\mu\eta\ \zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\nu\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\tau\omega\varsigma$, $\mu\eta\ \xi\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta\epsilon\ \alpha\phi\phi\rho\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ (*J. T. S.*, p. 574); and in verse 22 $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, A. V. "But what is commanded thee think thereupon *with reverence*."

Peters, adopting the misquotation of Talmud Babli, *Chag.* 13 a, noticed on page 444, writes on verse 21, "Gr., Syr., Bab. Talm. *Chag.* fol. 13 a, und Midrasch Rabba בראשית VIII (bei C.-N. p. xix [בחוק und בחוק]) treffen aber in חוק st. מוכוסה zusammen"; reads in that verse קשה for פלאות, and חוק for מוכוסה; and reads in verse 22 צורך (LXX $\chi\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$) for עסק.

The *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, art. *Sirach*, quoting Bacher and Lévi as authorities, again repeats the misquotation of Talm. Babli and the baseless textual theory evolved from it (IV, 4648, 1903). A footnote gives Bacher's suggestion that תרע is "an erroneous completion of the abbreviation 'תר', which should be read תדרש." But it is admitted that Job xi. 8 מִשְׁאֹל מִי־תִרְעַע עֲמֻקָּה accounts for עמוקה in the Talm. Jerus. citation (2), page 443. What more then is wanted to account for the words תרע מה next before עמוקה there, and for תרע בל along with אל תדרש in Gen. Rab. viii. 2?

The two aspects of פלאות were remarked upon in Part I of this article (p. 445). Their difficulty is indicated by the parallelism of חוק and נפלא in Sir. xxxix. 20:—

אין קטן ומעט עמו ואין נפלא וחוק ממנו:

"Ben Sira's saying about *the secret things* was evidently founded upon Deut. xxix. 28 (29):—

הנסתרות ליהוה אלהינו והנגלות לנו ולבנינו ער עולם

which would have suggested also his dative לך" (*J. T. S.*, p. 573). Probably the Greek of Sir. iii. 21 f. was influenced by Deut. *l.c.*, which is to the effect that "for us and for our children" it suffices to do what is plainly laid down in the Torah, and there is no need to be concerned about $\tau\alpha\ \kappa\rho\upsilon\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$.

But the further notion that one ought not to pry into such things would sooner or later have grown out of the saying 'הנסתרות כו'. This notion was probably in the mind of Ben Sira; and the mediaeval prejudice against free speculation and research seems to have rested in part upon his saying in Sir. iii. 21 f. as a Scriptural basis.

St. Augustine, in lib. xi. 12 (14) of his *Confessions*, prefaces his reply to the question, "What was God doing before he made heaven and earth?", with the remark that he will not reply as some one was said to have replied "ioculariter," namely that "*Alta scrutantibus gehennas parabat*," where (I suppose) there is an allusion to Sir. iii. (22) Lat. *Altiora te ne scrutatus fueris*.

Chaucer, in *The Miller's Prologue*, writes:—

A 3163 An housbond shall nat been inquisitif
 Of goddes privetee, nor of his wyf.

Here, again, we may see a reference to Ben Sira, who (according to the Latin) teaches that a man should not be *curiosus* in the "abscoudita" which are God's secrets. Chaucer's lines show plainly that the notion was a familiar and popular one. The variants in the Greek (p. 609) indicate that it was thought foolish and impious to try to be wise beyond what was written.

[במה ש] Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer in their *Original Heb. of Ecclus.* (p. xix) quote as probably the true form of verse 22:—

באשר הרשית [ה] התבונן לא יש לך עסק בנסתרות:

The *hé* which I have bracketed may be a dittograph, and אִין is preferable to לֹא יֵשׁ, but it may be that our author wrote באשר and not ש' במה. "Whether, or how often, Ben Sira used the Biblical ש' *relatif* is an unimportant detail" (*J. T. S.*, p. 580), which M. Lévi makes much of; but perhaps he is right in his general objection to it in *Ecclus.*, where it may always be accounted for as a variant for the full form אשר.

עסק] Syr. **ܠܫܬܬܐ ܚܝ ܫܠܡܐ**, "*Et ne sit tibi ausus in occulta*," as a paraphrase for 'אין לך עסק כו', *thou hast no business with the secret things*; and **ܠܫܬܬܐ** for הורשית. Gk. *χρεια* is a not impossible rendering of עסק as well as of צורך (p. 462), but Gr. *προσετάγη* is not an exact translation of Heb. הורשית.

Sir. iii. 31 *Whoso doeth good, it shall meet him in his ways* (?). Heb. **פועל טוב יקראנו בדרכיו**.

Cf. Sir. xii. 17 **אם רע קראך**, *If mischief hath befallen thee*. Schechter, in *Camb. B.S.*, giving a different sense to קרא, "Is. xli. 2 **צדק יקראוהו לרגלו**. The Gr. probably read יזכרנו for יקראנו." Strack, "cf. Is. 41. 2." Peters, "*μέμνηται* ist nicht Variante, sondern Erklärung der im Sinne von *rufen* gefassten יקראנו, das auch Syr. erklärend übersetzt (*es ist bereit auf seinem Wege*). Statt **בדרכיו** verlangt Syr. direkt . . . und Gr. indirekt . . . בארחו."

"If the Hebrew stood alone no change would be wanted." Thus I wrote (p. 446), thinking only of the sense of the verse as I understood it; but the first half of it would run better with a shorter word for יקראנו, thus:—

פועל טוב עתיד בדרכיו.

Sir. iv. 30. With **אריה** from C and **מתירא** from A I proposed (p. 448) to read:—

אל תהי כְּאַרְיֵה בביתך וּמְתִירָא בעבריך;

This gives an assonance in the style of Ben Sira with a play upon words perhaps suggested to him by Amos iii. 8, "A *lion* hath roared, who will not *fear*?"

Prof. Dr. Eberhard Nestle in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (IV, 547 b, 1902) gives the verse according to A and C, and continues as follows:—

"Can there be any doubt that A agrees with S and C with G? Compare especially the second clause, where S has two words, A has also two, C for one word of G has one word. What is more natural than the conclusion that A and C are not the original, but dependent upon S and G,

bring out or improve upon the sense of the original, and traces of such teaching may very well have found their way into the text of Eccles. as we have it.

(2) "The whole text of H is full of allusions to the OT," of which some are and some are not Ben Sira's. In the margin to the left of Sir. xxxv (xxxii). 3 והצנע שכל stands the variant לכת for שכל , the other variant having disappeared. The corruption והצנע and the pseudo-correction לכת are from Micah vi. 8 והצנע לכת . The missing variant was probably the true reading בהצנע , cf. Sir. xvi. 25 ובהצנע . The above-mentioned variant רופי may be said to be a corruption of Ben Sira's מום due to Psalm l. 20. For a number of variants of this class oral teaching may be assumed to be accountable, since in such teaching Biblical parallels would have been freely quoted.

(3) In his article, *A Further Fragment of Ben Sira* (*J. Q. R.*, XII), Dr. Schechter wrote on a fragment of the MS. C, "The writing is in a large hand, but its decipherment is sometimes rendered difficult by the fact that the sign ו may stand for *vaw*, *yod*, and even *resh*" (p. 456); with reference to chap. iv. 30 Gr. he writes, "It is, however, possible that originally it read ומתפחר " (p. 462); and he notes that chap. v. 13 מפליטו ¹ is a corruption of מפלתו (p. 463). So מתפחו , unless it can be shown to be the word wanted, may have come in as a clerical error.

[מתירא] Evidently ירא goes well with אריה as in Amos iii. 8. The hithpael (though with a different construction) occurs in chap. xii. 11 להתירא ממנו , but perhaps only as a variant. Gesen. s.v. ירא , "*Hithpa.* semel legitur in cod. Hebraeo-Samaritano Gen. XLII, 1, ubi pro hebr. למה תתראו Cod. Sam. habet תתיראו למה."

[מתפחו] Words from פחו , according to Mandelkern, are found in the Bible in the four places, Gen. xlix. 2, "*Unstable as water*"; Jud. ix. 4, "wherewith Abimelech hired vain

¹ Here again we have " ט for ה " (vol. XV, p. 467). Compare chap. xxxiv (xxxi). 14 אל תושש יד , marg. חשית with ה for ט .

and *light* persons"; Jer. xxiii. 32, "Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord, and cause my people to err by their lies and by their *lightness*"; Zeph. iii. 3, 4, "Her princes within her are roaring *lions*... Her prophets are *light* and treacherous persons." Here אֲרִיֹּת and פְּתוּיִם are antiparallels. The "light" prophets cringe to the "lions" instead of being lionlike and withstanding them. Neither from the Bible nor from Ecclus. itself is it obvious to me that מְתַפְּחִי would have had the sense wanted in Sir. iv. 30. The hithpael seems to be found there only.

Nestle cites for Heb. פָּחוּ passages read thus by Strack:—Sir. viii. 2 כִּי רַבִּים הַפְּחִין זֶהָב ; xix. 2 לֹב (יִפְחִי)וּ לֹב ; xli. 17 marg. עַל פָּחוּ, for אֵל זֹנוֹת ; xlii. 10 אֵל פָּחוּזָה, for (תַּהֲרִה) פֶּן .

For Syr. ܦܫܠ he cites Sir. xix. 2, xxiii. 4, 5, 21, 22 (*ap.* Walton), where the sense of the root is clearly *lascivus fuit*. See also Payne Smith's *Thesaurus*, where it is noted that the ethpael is used for יִתְעַלְּלוּ in Jud. xix. 25.

כלבי "So Syr. Cf. Septuagint, 1 Sam. xxv. 3 (*Keri* כלבי). Gr. כלביא, see Ed." (Camb. B. S., p. 42). Strack, "Syr. כלב, Gr. כלביא," without a query, although C reads כאריה. If this last was the original word it may have been altered to כלביא under the influence of Gen. xlix. 9 כאריה וכלביא or the like; and כלביא or כלבי may have been misread כלב as by Syr., the *kaf* of comparison being turned into the initial of כלב.

Syr. ܫܠܝܚܐ, *et severus ac terribilis*, looks like another trace of "lion" in the previous hemistich; for Syr. ܫܠܝܚܐ corresponds to Heb. זַעַף, cf. "Syr. ܫܠܝܚܐ *iratus* pro Heb. זַעַף 1 Reg. xx. 43, xxi. 4" (Gesen.); and the זַעַף of a king is like the roaring of a lion (Prov. xix. 12).

Nestle's parallel of אֲרִיֹּת and פְּתוּיִם in Zeph. *l.c.* is remarkable, but it might be thought to have led up to the reading מְתַפְּחִי as a corruption rather than to attest its genuineness. There may be much more to be said about the reading of the difficult verse Sir. iv. 30; but for the present I conclude provisionally that C קִאֲרִיָּה belongs to the true text, and

Sir. vi. 2 *Fall not into the hand of thine appetite ; That it should consume thy strength like an ox (?)*. 3 *It shall eat thy leaves and uproot thy fruit ; And leave thee like a dry tree.* Heb. for the second and third of the four hemistichs :—

Peters, with reference to Ryssel's conjectural תִּשָּׂר, writes that "תִּשָּׂר erklärt sich befriedigend, so dass eine Änderung . . . unnötig ist." The *prima facie* incongruity of תִּשָּׂר raises the question of the genesis of the saying. An ox does not root up like a boar; and if an ox could reach to strip a tree "clean bare" (Joel i. 7), this would not make it יִבֵּשׁ. Ben Sira takes up the phrase "a dry tree" because of its use in Isa. lvi. 3 אֲנִי עֵץ יָבֵשׁ; and he takes כִּשּׁוֹר from Num. xxii. 4, "Now shall this company lick up all that are round about us, as the ox licketh up the grass of the field." Then *shor* suggests *shoresh*, and he uses שָׂרֵשׁ in the sense of Job xxxi. 12 בְּכָל תְּבוּאוֹת תִּשְׂרֵשׁ, "*in omni fructu meo radices evelleret*, i. e. *radicitus exstirparet fructum*." Yet another metaphor is suggested by בָּעָר (Isa. v. 5).

Sir. vii. 18 וְאֵל תְּלִי. A good form of the verse would be, with תמים as suggested on page 453:—

Peters adopts Nöldeke's ואח תלים (p. 452). Syr. ראית לך

would then (I suppose) be explained by a confusion of tongues; but it may be worth while to give another explanation of it as from תמים. Retranslating and abbreviating we get אִישׁ; א' יֵשׁ [לך]; אִשְׁרֵי יֵשׁ לך (cf. Sir. xliv. 17 נח בו') a little before תמים would account for אִישׁ, as Micah vi. 8 elsewhere for לכת (p. 613); and Syr. may have read אִישׁ as for א' יֵשׁ לך in place of תמים.

Sir. vii. 23. "For לָהֶם read לָהֶם" (Cowley). So the word is to be read, but it is not said how it was written.

(1) In the *segol* under the ה, according to the facsimile, two of the dots have been run together, so as to make a short line sloping to the left with the remaining dot to the left of it. Compare the pointing of Sir. x. 9 גִּיּוּ, where the scribe seems to have written ִּ instead of ִּ (p. 459) and afterwards to have run the two dots of the *shva* together. Peters reads גִּיּוּ, Strack defectively גִּיּוּ.

(2) The ל is pointed with a long קמץ, written not in the modern way but in the form of a *pathach* with a dot under it (*J. F.*, chap. iii. n. 19), as in the last line of the page containing גִּיּוּ. For chap. xiv. 9 מָעַט it is said, "read מָעַט" (Cowley). But, although the pause form is not wanted, there is a dot on the line under the *ayin*, which may have been meant to be separate from it as in שׁ in the last line of the page.

Sir. vii. 31 (?) לַחֵם אֲבִירִים. See pages 453 f., 626.

Strack gives לַחֵם אֲבִירִים, with the footnote, "Ps. 78. 25"; and in his Glossary אֲבִירִים (לַחֵם). From the facsimile (line 3) it seems to me not impossible that the scribe wrote אֲבִירִים. Perhaps the word is clearer in the MS.

Sir. vii. 35 אֵל חֶשֶׁא לֵב מֵאוּרֹב. See page 455, where it was proposed to read with *yod* for *hé* as an emendation:—

אֵל חֶשֶׁא לֵב מֵאוּרֹב כִּי מִמֶּנּוּ תִּתְּקֶהב :

In line 6 of the same page, i.e. three lines below (?) אֲבִירִים, stands certainly (I should say) מֵאוּרֹב, although Peters reads

it אורב with *daleth*; and so Strack in his text, but with the footnote, "Cod. מאורב (?)." The facsimile shows that there is a crease in the paper, and this has brought the ה close to the ב. The versions may have read אורב (Peters), or כויאב (Lévi); but in the facsimile I can only see אורב.

The R.V. renders chap. vii. 32-35 thus:—

- 32 Also to the poor man stretch out thy hand,
That thy blessing may be perfected.
- 33 A gift hath grace in the sight of every man living;
And for a dead man keep not back grace.
- 34 Be not wanting to them that weep;
And mourn with them that mourn.
- 35 Be not slow to visit a sick man;
For by such things thou shalt gain love.

"Après l'aumône, la charité envers les morts, la consolation des gens en deuil, vient, en G. et en S., le devoir *de visiter les malades*" (Lévi). Thus Gr. and Syr. bring in sickness after death and mourning. Edersheim inappositely remarks on verse 34, that "The same sentiment is expressed in Rom. xii. 15, but there more truly and beautifully." How would it be more true to say Χαίρειν μετὰ χαϊρόντων in a context relating to death and mourning? The proposed reading מאויב, *from an enemy*, in verse 35 satisfies the requirements of sense and rhythm.

Sir. x. 9 . . . *For that while he lives his body is exalted?*
10 . . . *A king to day, to morrow he falls.* 11 *When a man dies he inherits worms.*

The contrast of בחייו יורם (ver. 9) with במות כו' (ver. 11) shows that יורם is not to be connected organically with רמה *worm* (p. 460). In verse 10 יפול *falls* confirms the interpretation of יורם, *is exalted*.

"For יורם again see verse 23 ואין לכבד כל איש יורם (p. 458). Here Lévi had written, "La restitution de M. Adler, que nous avons gardée faute de mieux, est, d'ailleurs, sujette à caution. En tout cas, on ne saurait y voir חמס," i.e. in

place of יורם. Strack, following Peters, reads חמס (Syr. עילא, Gr. ἀμαρτωλόν), but partly in brackets thus:—

אין לבנות דל משכיל ואין לכבד כל איש (חמס):

The Syriac (*ap.* Walton) is a plausible paraphrase:—

Non est quod pauper iustus ignominia afficiatur;

Nec quod dives iniquus honoretur.

Gr., showing no trace of “dives”:—

οὐ δίκαιον ἀτιμάσαι πτωχὸν συνετόν,
καὶ οὐ καθήκει δοξάσαι ἄνδρα ἀμαρτωλόν.

Looking again at the last word of the verse in the facsimile, in the middle of line 9 of the page, I read it as before יורם with Mr. Elkan Adler, and “en tout cas” not חמס. “Litera ultima est aut ס aut מ” (Strack). The former and final *mem* are sometimes scarcely to be distinguished in the MS. Here I should read *mem*, but in any case the traces of letters before it decide against חמס. The letter next before the last was (I think) a *resh*. Supposing it traced *backwards*, what remains is the apex at the end of it. This might belong to some other letter, but not to a מ; for a good example of which see the first letter of the page, where the apex is a short straight line making about half a right angle with an edge of the paper. A מ in the next line is less unlike the supposed מ of חמס, but the first letter of the word in question cannot have been *cheth*. Reading it as *yod* we have the letter ending where it should end, with a curve to the left, whereas *cheth* begins with a straight stroke, sloping (as in חמס in the first line of the page) to the right. After the *yod* there is just room for the *vau* wanted to complete יורם.

I take the proposed חמס to be, not a simple reading of the text as we have it, but a compromise between the Hebrew and the Versions. Syr. עילא is a possible rendering of חמס; but Ben Sira would not have written איש חמס כ' with כל (Strack) or without it (Gr., Syr., Peters), giving the needless and inappropriate advice not to honour a man of

violence, or not to do so in all cases. Variants in *Ecclus.* being sometimes synonyms (p. 612), Gr. and Syr. together might be thought to suggest a word from עֵלָה, as מַעֲוֵלָה, הַעֲלָה, נַעֲלָה, in place of יוֹרֵם, some word connoting high estate being required by the parallelism. On the interpolation in the A.V. (p. 458) see the article next after this (p. 627 f.).

[יצהיב] On Sir. xliii. 9 Bacher suggests that "Ben Sira wrote perhaps עָרִי מַצְהִיב . . . or עָרִי מוֹהִיב" (*J.Q.R.*, XII, 102).

[רמה] Under רמם II, *putrescere*, Mandelkern gives Ex. xvi. 20 וַיֵּרָם תּוֹלְעִים וַיִּבָּאֵשׁ 20; and then for רמה, *vermis*, Ex. xvi. 24; Isa. xiv. 11; Job vii. 5, xvii. 14, xxi. 26, xxiv. 24, xxv. 6. Under רמם I, *altum esse*, he gives *inter alia* Job xxiv. 24 רָמוּ מַעַם וַאֲיִנּוּ. Probably Ex. l. c. and Job (cf. p. 460) suggested to Ben Sira the contrast of רמם I or רום with רמם II and רָפָה.

Sir. xii. 5 *d* and xxxi. 10 *d*. "For רַע read רַעָה" (Cowley). In the former verse (p. 462), without referring to the facsimile, I read conjecturally, with כִּי for Gr. γὰρ and רַעָה for רַע:—

כִּי פִי שְׁנִיִּים רַעָה תִּשִּׁי.

Sir. xii. 10 *Never trust an enemy; for like as brass his wickedness cankereth.* 11 *And if he humble himself, and go crouching; Set thy heart to fear him. Be to him as one that divineth a secret . . .; And know thou the end of his jealousy.* 12 *Suffer him not to stand beside thee; Lest he thrust thee away, and stand in thy place.*

In vol. XIII of the *WZKM*, or "Vienna Oriental Journal" (1899), Prof. Dr. G. Bickell has an article entitled, "Der hebräische Sirachtext eine Rückübersetzung." In the first paragraph he writes, that the impression left upon him by the Oxford *Original Heb. of Ecclus.*, namely "dass wir es hier nicht mit einem Originaltexte zu thun haben," was made a certainty by the Cambridge *B.S.* "Um diese Ueberzeugung vor den Fachgenossen zu begründen, mögen einstweilen zwei, wie ich glaube, entscheidende Beweise genügen, da mir durch besondere Gefälligkeit der Redaction

gestattet ist, diesen Aufsatz noch in dem vorliegenden, eigentlich bereits abgeschlossenen, Hefte erscheinen zu lassen, und ich daher möglichst wenig Raum zu beanspruchen wünsche." Writing rapidly, Dr. Bickell has made some statements which wanted further consideration.

The first proof is from the Acrostic at the end of Eccclus., which we must pass over for the present. The second is from the "Hexastich" xii. 10, 11, "welches zugleich zeigt, dass neben der durchgängigen Abhängigkeit von der Peschitto doch auch die griechische Uebersetzung, oder vielmehr irgend ein Ausfluss derselben, wahrscheinlich ein syrischer, gelegentlich benutzt wird." Briefly, Heb. is a retranslation from Syr. and Gr.

The Hebrew for the Hexastich is:—

אל תאמין בשונא לעד 10
כי כנחשת רעו יחליא:
וגם אם ישמע לך ויהלך בנחת 11
תן לבך להתירא ממנו:
היה לו כמגלה רז ולא ימצא להשחיתך
ודע אחרית קנאה:

For this the Greek of B, with variants, is:—

- 10 μὴ πιστεύῃς τῷ ἐχθρῷ σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα·
ὥς γὰρ ὁ χαλκὸς ἰούται, οὕτως ἡ πορνεία αὐτοῦ.
11 καὶ ἐὰν ταπεινωθῇ καὶ πορεύηται συγκεκυφώς,
ἐπίστησον τὴν ψυχὴν σου καὶ φύλαξαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
καὶ ἔση αὐτῷ ὥς ἐκμεμαχὸς (al.-μάσσω) ἔσοπτρον,
καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι οὐκ εἰς (Syro-hex. ὅτι εἰς) τέλος κατίωσε
(al. -ίωται).

The Syriac is to the effect:—

- 10 Ne unquam fidas inimico ;
Quoniam similis est aeri *sibi contiguum* (ܐܝܪܝܢܐ) contaminanti.
11 Etiam si tibi pareat, et ante te demissus incedat ;
Adverte tamen animum tuum, ut eum pertimescas.

Sis illi quasi secretum declarans, nec te poterit depravare;

Imo finem *odii eius* (וְסִנְאוֹ) reprehendes.

(1) In the Hexastich, according to Bickell, Heb. follows "im Ganzen genau dem Syrer"; but in the second clause, where Syr. by mistake reads Heb. רֵעוֹ אֶרְעוֹ, *his companion*, the retranslator into Heb. comes upon the original word as a retranslation from Gr. ἡ πορνεία αὐτοῦ.

(2) His other argument is still more artificial. The sixth clause was in the original "jedenfalls וְתָרַע כִּי לֹא לִנְצָה וְיִחַלֵּי," giving a fine word play, "da וְיִחַלֵּי sowohl *rosten* als *heucheln* bedeutet." Syr., omitting the negative, gave the rendering, "und du wirst das Ende erkennen, dass es ihn *schwarz gemacht hat*," with blackening in the sense of "Beschämen oder ins Unglück Stürzen," the last word in Syr. (as Bickell reads it) being *d'qannē'athēh*, a derivative from Gr. κύνειος; and the article ends thus:—

"Und dieses griechische Wort hat der hebräische Uebersetzer in seiner syrischen Vorlage gefunden, für semitisch gehalten, und mit dem hebräischen קִנְאָה (Eifer, Hass) identificirt! Für den Kairiner Text hier Unsprünglichkeit anzunehmen, erscheint unmöglich, da nur ein Uebersetzer aus dem Syrischen das mit dem griechischen Texte übereinstimmende und von Sinn und Zusammenhang geforderte וְסִנְאוֹ für das hebräische קִנְאָה halten konnte, *welches im Syrischen gar nicht vorkommt* und dort durch das nicht nur sachlich, sondern auch phonetisch entsprechende וְסִנְאוֹ vertreten wird."

For an example of the word thus said not to occur at all in Syriac, we have only to look it out in the little lexicon in Kirsch's *Chrestomathia Syriaca*, as re-edited by Bernstein in 1836, and there we find (p. 449), with reference to Bar Hebraeus on Job:—

וְסִנְאוֹ f., v. He. et Ch. קִנְאָה, q. cfr., st. emph. Ch. קִנְאוּתָה *zelotypia, invidia*, p. 190, l. 13, et *odium*.

Turning then (with Peters) to Payne Smith's *Thesaurus*

Syriacus we find several other examples of the word, one of them in *Eccles.* itself, where it stands for Gr. *μῆνις* (xxvii. 30); as well as the forms *מַלְל* and *מַל* in the sense *zelus, invidia, odium*. The *Thesaurus* gives also *מַלְל*, *κύνειος*, but not in *Sir.* xii. 11.

Verse 10] Heb. and Syr. on the whole agreeing, and the former being right and the latter wrong in the word *רועו*, which Syr. mispoints *רעו*, *سبحو*, it is natural to give the originality to Heb. A retranslator from Gr. *ἡ πονηρία αὐτοῦ* would have written:—

כי כנחשת רעתו תחליא.

Verse 11] Heb. *ויהלך בנחת* may very well be original, but Gr. suggests some such word as *ישון* or *ישח* or *יכנע* instead of *ישמע לך*; and I doubt also the originality of *להחירא*. *Eccles.* ix. 17 *בנחת נשמעים* may have given rise to *ישמע לך*. Omitting the intermediate words *ולא כו'* (clause 5) as a gloss, and taking a suggestion from Syr. *وَمِلَالِهِ*, "*odii eius*," I would read, with *הו* for *ה* at the end of the verse:—

היה לו במגלה רז ודע אחרית קנאתו:

This gives the required sense, "Be to him as a *galeh razin* (p. 464); look to the *end* of his jealousy; and (ver. 12) give him no opportunity against thee." Compare:—

vii. 36 בבל מעשיך זכור אחרית ולעולם לא תשחת:

See page 454 for the preceding verses. In chap. vii. 36 one is to consider the *end* or outcome of his own doings; in chap. xii. 11 the *end* of his enemy's *קנאה*. In the one case *לעולם לא תשחת*, and in the other *להשחיתך לא ימצא*. That this last is a gloss is further attested by the Greek.

Verse 11 ends in the R.V., representing Gr. B:—

And thou shalt be unto him as one that hath wiped a mirror,

And thou shalt know that he hath not utterly rusted it
(Or, *it hath not utterly rusted him*).

It is not clear to me how to explain this so as to harmonize it with verse 12. But Gr. may be read, with

variants as above, in the sense, "And thou shalt be unto him as one that *wipeth* a mirror; and thou shalt know that *it hath been utterly rusted*." The enemy being past hope of amendment, a caution follows to the effect, Give him no opportunity to harm thee (ver. 12). Verse 11 *c, d* in this sense would have come from Heb. *ודע אחרית חלאותיו*, *and know the end of his rust*. Gr. B would have to be understood as a paraphrase for, "know that there is an end of it," it is not *ἐὶς τέλος*, *לנצח*.

Sir. xiii. 26 *A token of a merry heart is a bright countenance; And study and meditation is wearisome thought.*
Heb.:—

עקבת לב טוב פנים אורים ושיג ושיח מחשבת עמל:

The Greek of B for this is:—

*ἵχνος καρδίας ἐν ἀγαθοῖς πρόσωπον θάλλον,
καὶ εὐρεσις παραβολῶν διαλογισμοὶ μετὰ κόπον.*

In the Syriac the verse ends:—

Et multitudo narrationum cogitationes scelestorum;

ܡܬܬܘܕܐ ܕܢܚܪܐܝܝܬܐ ܕܥܘܓܝܬܐ ܕܫܥܝܪܐ.

In his article on "Ecclesiasticus: The Retranslation Hypothesis" (*J. Q. R.*, XII, 560 f.), the late Mr. Thomas Tyler called attention to the two verses Sir. xiii. 26, xiv. 11, "as giving pretty conclusive evidence" in favour of the genuineness of the Hebrew. His contention that *שיג ושיח* (from 1 Kings xviii. 27 *כי שיה וכי שיג לו*) accounts for Gr. and Syr., but could not have been derived from them is well supported, although he somewhat strangely makes Gr. *παραβολῶν* the word for Heb. *מחשבת*.

שיג Tyler, "retirement," and for the hemistich, "But the close study of problems is toilsome." Gr. *εὐρεσις* (A *εὐρέσεις*) as from *נשג* hiph., cf. Sir. xiv. 13 *השיגת ידך*, xxxii (xxxv). 12 *השגת ידך*, Gr. *εὕρεμα χειρός*; Sap. Sol. xiv. 12 *εὐρέσεις*; and see *εὐρίσκειν* in the *Oxford Concordance*. Syr. "multitudo," as from *שגה*, cf. Eccles. xii. 12 *ܡܬܬܘܕܐ ܕܢܚܪܐܝܝܬܐ*, "and much study is a weariness of the flesh."

ושיח] Cowley, "For ושיח read ושיח," but it may be read as ושיח with a stunted *vau*. Gesen. "*sermo, confabulatio . . . meditatio*," and hence Gr. here παραβολῶν. Syr. *narrationum*, cf. the rabbinic שיחה.

מחשבת עמל] Gr., as if for מחשבות עם עמל, διαλογισμοὶ μετὰ κόπου (A 8 -ων), cf. Jer. iv. 14 מחשבות אונן, διαλογισμοὶ πόνων σου; or διαλογισμὸς (248, Syro-hex.) κτέ. Syr. "*scelestorum*," from עמל taken as in Num. xxiii. 21; Isa. x. 1.

Sir. xv. 14 *He (?) from the beginning created man; [And put him into the hand of him that would spoil him;] And gave him into the hand of his inclination.*

The verse is given below as it stands in the MS. in lines 6 and 5 from the end of the page, with Mr. Cowley's reading of the small letters above two of its words:—

ותעבה שנא יי ולא יאננה ליראיו; אלהים מבראשית
א ברא אדם וישתיהו ביד חותפו ויתנהו ביד יצרו: אם

The Cambridge *Wisdom of Ben Sira* gave כ as doubtful instead of the *teth*, to be read perhaps before אלהים; and ה instead of the *cheth* thus אדם^ה. I do not see clearly from the facsimile what was written above אדם, but there is nothing before it above the line as in Camb. B. S. Mr. Cowley, taking the *cheth* and *teth* as numerals, explains that "אדם is to be read eighth and מבראשית ninth word in the line." The order אדם ב' מ' would not be quite natural. Perhaps it was meant that the two words מבראשית ברא were to be placed before אדם.

Peters takes the 8 as for אלהים, and the small letters as meaning *eighth* and *ninth* "sc. von links." Strack writes האדם, with the note "ה supra lineam," and omits the ט and the א. This *alef* (or part of an *alef*) really belongs, I suppose, to אדם, which the scribe was beginning to write by mistake before ברא.

The verse begins in Gr. ἀντὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς, and so in Syr. ap. Walton. It seems to me to be improved in Heb. by the shortening of אלהים (Lag. אלה) to הוא, which I take to be its true first word.

Verse 26 מראש suggests here מראשית, the ב being doubtless an interpolation from Gen. i. 1. Omitting the first member of the doublet, I would accordingly read:—

הוא מראשית ברא אדם ויתנהו ביר יצרו:

See in verse 12 הוא התקילני, and in the next Gr. ἐμύσησεν ὁ Κύριος, but Syr. simply ܡܢܐ.

Prof. Bevan, in his review of the Cambridge edition, has a good conjecture in the omitted clause כו' (sic) וישתיהו:—

“xv. 14. וישתיהו ביר חותפו ויתנהו ביר יצרו. That these two clauses are doublets is shown by the Gr. and the Syr. The synonyms וישתיהו (read וישתיהו) and ויתנהו present no difficulty, but how does חותפו ‘his robber’ correspond to יצרו ‘his nature’? If the latter be the original reading, it is incredible that so obscure a term as חותפו should have been substituted for it by a scribe. Are we therefore to assume that Ben Sira wrote חותפו?... Here the sense demands an assertion of man’s free-will, and this we obtain by reading חירותו, according to the common Syriac use of ܡܢܐܝܢ for ‘moral free-will.’ יצר, like חירות, is a neutral term, i. e. it denotes inclination towards good or towards evil.”

In defence of חותפו here, on which see Peters, as an actual variant it might be said that not all variants in our Hebrew text are appropriate. But it may be safely assumed that Ben Sira himself did not write ביר חותפו.

Sir. xvi. 23, 24. “Read חסדי (?) לב יכינו (?) אלה ונבר פ[ן] תה; the ו printed above נבר is really the tail of the ק in צדק in the line above. ... [מש]לי what is left of the first two letters suggests שכלי” (Cowley).

Verse 23] It seems evident that חסדי was written for חסרי; but after לב stands יכינו with a not very well finished *beth*, as in בכל in the line above.

In ונבר (Schechter) it may be thought that the scribe wrote the *vau* in contact with the *beth*, i. e. as low down as possible in order to clear the ק above it. The next word is not פ.תה (Cowley) with space for a *vau*, but either עתה

(Schechter) or, if the first letter be א according to Cowley and others, then אהה. The letter is open at the top and might be read as an *ayin*, with only a remnant of its shorter stroke remaining. Whatever the scribe meant to write, Gr. *πλανώμενος* suggests חועה.

Verse 24] Peters, "Von dem letzten Worte des 1. St. ist nur ל erhalten." But in the facsimile as I have it there are certainly parts of three letters, which I read ככל, followed by a *yod*. "Perhaps the scribe wrote ככלי for שכל, Gr. *ἐπιστήμη*" (p. 474).

C. TAYLOR.

PS.—With reference to Sir. vii. 31, 35, Mr. Elkan Adler, on his return to England, now writes (19th June, 1903), "I do not doubt that מאהב is the reading of my fragment. There is a crease in the paper, which makes the photograph faulty here. אבירים is not so clear. There does not seem to be a ' run into the ר."

(To be continued.)